



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/956,314 10/05/92 FENNELL

R CM00221UP00

EXAMINER

PERZLE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2604

DATE MAILED: 11/19/93

MOTOROLA, INCORPORATED  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
1500 NW 22 AVENUE  
BOYNTON BEACH, FL 33426-8292

26M2/1119

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

- ☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), \_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

**Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.      | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.                  |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____  |

**Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION**

1. ☒ Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-16 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 2604

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over DeLuca et al. in view of Learn and further in view of common practice in the art as shown by Kamo.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 9 and 13, a selective call receiver (10) comprising a receiver (12) for receiving a message, a display (27) for displaying a message, and buttons (22-26) for interacting with the message in order to modify it are disclosed by DeLuca on Figures 1 and 2 and in column 2, lines 35-43 and columns 3 and 4, lines 62-6. A key pad display is not disclosed by DeLuca as a means to modify, edit or generate text on the display 27.

Learn in the analogous art of Selective Visual Display Communication Systems discloses a hand held data entry unit that

has a display for a message (19), a key pad arrangement panel (10), a buttons (12a-12f) for interacting with the panel to modify the message. It would be logical for a person who is skilled in the paging art to look to the visual display communications art in general for ideas on enhancing display arrangements for a selective call receiver for purposes of editing messages displayed. Learn evidences text modification of information at 19 by utilizing a keypad display 14 and a set of control keys 12a-f; 18a-f plus a cursor control. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify DeLuca's pager with a keypad arrangement similar to Learn's display panel (10) for interacting with the key pad arrangement to modify the message because Learn teaches that this technique was known in the art of message displays, text editing, in general and would have been a routine matter to utilize in any art device incorporating a message display device.

Regarding claims 3, 10, 15, and 16, a matrix (14) of alphanumeric characters are disclosed by Learn in Figure 1 and described in column 3, lines 34-51. Thus, Learn suggests that the features of claims 3, 10, 15 and 16 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 4, selecting one or more of the alphanumeric characters to modify a message is disclosed by DeLuca in Figures

8, 11 and 14 and described in column 4, lines 11-28 and columns 4 and 5, lines 65-6 and by Learn in column 2, lines 57-62 and column 4, lines 4-24. Thus both DeLuca and Learn suggest the features of claim 4 would have been obvious to the artisan at the time of the invention.

Claim 6 adds the limitation that the key panel arrangement provides for editing received messages. DeLuca provides for editing in Figures 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12 and 14 and columns 3-5, lines 21-33. Learn provides ~~for~~ editing a message in Figure 1 with a backspace button (18d) and erase button (18e) which can be used with matrix (14) and buttons (12a-12e) to edit the message display (19). Thus both DeLuca and Learn taken as a whole suggest that editing of a message using an alphanumeric display would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 7, creating personalized messages using the alphanumeric matrix panel (14) is shown by Learn in Figure 1 and described in columns 3 and 4 on lines 42-15. Thus Learn suggests the matter of claim 7 would have been obvious to the artisan.

Claim 8 adds the limitation that the alphanumeric keys can be a special font or language. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to design the keys for a particular language or font. For example, Kamo uses Japanese characters for his pager display on page 129.

Regarding claim 11, one or more control buttons (18a-18f) that interact with the key pad matrix (14) are disclosed by Learn on Figure 1 and in column 4, lines 4-11. Thus Learn suggests the features of claim 11 would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 12 adds the limitation that the key pad matrix is a liquid crystal display. Learn discloses a key pad matrix (14) of characters inscribed on keys instead of characters and a cursor on a liquid crystal display. These two structures perform the same function and were well known in the art at the time of the invention. An artisan skilled in the art would have found it obvious to substitute columns and rows of characters inscribed on keys for characters and a cursor on a liquid crystal display because both are well known equivalents to persons of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 14, a key pad (14) for adding information independent of the received message is shown by Learn in Figure 1 and described in column 3, line 42 to column 4, line 15 where it states that when the user presses the appropriate button (12a-12f) the character is entered into memory and the display (19). Thus it would have been obvious to the artisan to modify DeLuca's pager with a key pad arrangement similar to Learn's display panel (10) to add information independent of the received message because Learn teaches that this capability was known to be

Serial No. 956,314

-6-

Art Unit 2604

reasonably applicable to the paging art in which visual displays are incorporated.

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Nashino discloses an information processor with a keyboard and two displays.

b. Sebestyen Re. 32,365 has a key pad for editing a message.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Edward Merz at telephone number (703) 305-4869.

*Em*  
E. Merz:lsd  
November 9, 1993

*Donald J. Yusk*  
DONALD J. YUSKO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 264